DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 469 JC 900 320

AUTHOR Torres, Belinda M.; Kapes, Jerome T.
TITLE Work Values and Job Satisfaction of Potential Minority Leaders in Community College Settings.
PUB DATE 26 Jan 90
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, January 26, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Black Leadership; *Blacks; College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Hispanic Americans; *Job Satisfaction; *Leadership; Minority Groups; Surveys; Two Year Colleges; *Values; *Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to investigate the work values and degree of job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in community colleges and technical institutes in Texas. In addition, the study examined the relationship between participation in the Minority Leadership Development Project (MLDP), ethnicity, gender, professional experience, and educational level and work values and job satisfaction. The study sample included 73 Black and Hispanic educators who were considered potential leaders in community colleges in Texas, including 37 individuals who had been selected for the MLDP. Information from the participants was gathered using the Demographic Information Sheet for personal information, the Values Scale (VS), and the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) as measures of work values; and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire as a measure of job satisfaction. Study findings, based on a 100% response rate, included the following: (1) the six highest held values identified by the VS were Cultural Identity, Advancement, Creativity, Aesthetics, Authority, and Economic Security; (2) the MIQ found the most important values to be Compensation, Authority, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, and Supervision-Technical; (3) MLDP participants valued Ability Utilization, Advancement, Responsibility, and Autonomy more highly than the non-MLDP group; (4) the MLDP participants were less satisfied with their current jobs than the non-MLDP group; (5) few differences were found among the responses of Black and Hispanic, and male and female participants; and (6) years of professional experience and level of education did not appear to be related to work values held by the minority leadership candidates studied. Data tables are included. (WJT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319469

WORK VALUES AND JOB SATISFACTION OF POTENTIAL MINORITY LEADERS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE SETTINGS.

Belinda M. Torres
Graduate Assistant
Educational Psychology
Texas A&M University

and

Jerome T. Kapes
Professor
Educational Psychology
Texas A&M University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. M. Torres

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association January 26, 1990 Austin, Texas.

Running Head: Values/Satisfaction

JC900320

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Minorities, specifically Blacks and Hispanics, have been traditionally excluded from or are underrepresented in administrative positions in colleges and universities (Bernstein, 1984; Garza, 1984; Harvard, 1986; Rivera, 1983; and Tinsley, 1985). Also, minority leadership is a subject that remains largely unexplored (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987).

During the late 1960's, leadership development programs were established in an effort to bring more minorities into the mainstream of American society and its educational institutions. National and state studies on the degree of minority participation in higher education have revealed that leadership programs focus on the the development of higher educational management skills, not on learning about the characteristics of minority leaders. Also, the programs are seldom evaluated during and/or after the training (Willie, 1984).

In a study, Today's Academic Leaders in Community and Junior Colleges by Moore (1985), it was found that 92% of the administrators were White, 6% were Black, and 2% were Hispanic. This data clearly shows that minority administrators are underrepresented in community college administrative positions. While research studies on women in two-year college administrative positions are scarce, there are even less studies on minority two-year college administrators (Moore, 1985).

One reason for the few studies on minority two-year community college administrators is that it is difficult to identify racial and ethnic groups employed in administration. In one of those studies, Rivera (1983) reported that of the 106 community colleges in California, only 47% had one of more Hispanic administrators, and most of these administrators were in instruction or student affairs. The number of Hispanic administrators identified in the study is relatively small considering that Weiler & Associates (1982) reported a 7% increase of minority enrollment at the California community colleges. In fact, the combined proportion of Black and Hispanic enrollment was more than twice as great at the community college as at the four year colleges at University of California and California State University.

Kimmons (1977) studied Black two-year college administrators to determine what line positions Black administrators occupy. He found that Black administrators tend to occupy positions in instruction or as program directors. These are staff but not line positions. Staff positions give advice, whereas line positions connote action. Another study by the North Carolina Community College System (1978) examined minority representation in administration, and faculty and staff employment patterns. It concluded that representation of minorities in administration had not improved in the community colleges despite the implementation of affirmative action policies.

Minority administrative leadership in the two-year college

is clearly a subject worthy of additional research. Within the last 30 to 40 years, community colleges have expanded their traditional function to include the interests and needs of the wider community (Barrera, 1984). They have attracted a more diverse population than the traditional university-bound student and serve people of more varied ages, background, ethnicity, and educational goals.

Faculty and administrative positions in community colleges need to be staffed by individuals reflecting the ethnic background of the students. Statistics illustrate that although community colleges have large percentages of minority students, neither administrative staff nor faculty reflect the percentages of these minorities (Garza, 1984).

Leadership development programs may train potential minority administrators, but research needs to be conducted on leadership development programs for minorities to identify the characteristics of potential leaders. While this research could be accomplished in a wide variety of ways, one approach would be to use measures of values to profile potential minority leaders. Values are important factors in determining individual behavior and choices. More specifically, work values are important determinants of occupational choice and future goals (Super, 1970). An assessment of work values could provide useful information about why potential minority leaders choose a certain work environment. This information could also be used to encourage minorities to enter and/or advance in leadership positions.

Job satisfaction is assessed by measuring a worker's level of satisfaction with various job aspects or facets (Weiss, et al., 1967). Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are considered in the measurement of job satisfaction. What is known and learned about the job satisfaction of potential minority leaders could be used to change those factors within a job that can be changed, or for helping individuals accomodate those factors that are less subject to change.

The purpose of this research was to identify the work values and degree of job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in community colleges and technical institutes. In addition, the study examined participation in a minority leadership development program, as well as important moderator variables, as they impacted work values and job satisfaction.

It was the purpose of this research to answer the following questions:

1) What are the work values and current job satisfaction of of potential minority community college leaders?

2) How do work values and job satisfaction differ when potential minority leaders are compared on:

   a) participation in the Minority Leadership Development Project (MLDP),
   b) ethnicity,
   c) gender,
   d) professional experience, and
   e) level of education.

Method

Population and Sample

The population of interest in this research was Black and Hispanic educators who are considered potential leaders in community college settings in Texas. The sample was drawn from the applicant pool for the Texas A&M Minority Leadership Development Project (MLDP).

Each of the community colleges and technical institutes in Texas, by campus, were given an opportunity to nominate two individuals to participate in the leadership project. There were approximately 73 individuals nominated and 37 were selected for participation in the leadership training. All 73 nominees were included in the study. The subjects in the selected group were nominated and are currently participating in the Texas A&M MLDP. The subjects in the non-selected group were nominated, but were not participating in the leadership project. Selection was based on the following criteria: completed application, three letters of recommendation, and completion of two essay questions on leadership.

Instrumentation

Characteristics of the potential minority leaders were studied using biographical data, two measures of work values, and a job satisfaction instrument. The Demographic Information Sheet (DIS) was used to acquire self-report of subject's ethnicity, gender, number of years of professional experience, and level of education. The Values Scale (VS) and the ranked form

of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) were utilized as measures of work values. The long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was utilized as the measure of of job satisfaction.

The VS, which was developed out of the Work Importance Study by Super (1981) measures intrinsic and extrinsic values. The instrument was created for national and cross-national use. It is appropriate for adults and for studies of career development at various ages and with different cultural groups. Reliability for the VS as measured by the coefficient alpha ranged from .67 to .87 for adults. The VS's validity is supported by data on occupational differences, cultural differences, socialization, and life stages. In addition, factor analyses was conducted across age groups in the United States. The VS uses a 4 point scale which yields 21 separate values. The 21 values are reported in raw scores which can be converted to T scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The raw scores obtained for each of the 21 values were converted to standard scores using the tables provided in the test manual. The standard scores were based on a sample of adults in the United States.

The MIQ measures an individual's vocational needs and values. A study by Rounds and Dawis (1975) concluded that the MIQ ranked form profiles are as stable as the paired form profiles. In addition, the ranked form completion time is one-half the completion time for the paired form, and subjects usually prefer

the ranked form over the paired form. The MIQ is an ipsative instrument requiring sets of five value statements to be ranked. These 21 scales yield a need score which may range from -4.00 to +4.00. The scale range is divided into two regions of importance and unimportance by the zero (0.00) point. While actual MIQ scores fall within the range of -1.00 to +3.00, the MIQ reports 0.00 as the median point. For this study, two points were added to the scores for each scale and the new score was then multiplied by ten. By doing this, the negative numbers and decimal points were eliminated. This made the new zero point equal to 20 (0.00 + 2 X 10 = 20), the lowest score available equal to 10 (equivalent to -1.00), and the highest score equal to 50 (equivalent to +3.00). Reliability for the MIQ is presented in terms of internal consistency of scales, the temporal stability of scales, and temporal stability of profiles. The median reliability coefficients for the 21 MIQ scales range from .77 to .81. Internal consistency reliability is reported in the form of Hoyt reliability coefficients which range from .30 to .95. Test-retest correlations, based on immediate to ten-month intervals range from .53 to .89. Various types of validity information is available on the MIQ based on over 30 years of research. For example, the 21 scales of the MIQ have been shown to discriminate among nine occupational groups.

The MSQ assesses an employee's job satisfaction in 20 job related areas. It measures actual satisfaction with a reinforcer whereas the MIQ measures the importance of a reinforcer

to the individual. The authors of the Manual for the MSQ Weiss, et al. (1967) recommend using the long form since the 15-20 minutes required to complete the instrument is a relatively short period of time. The MSQ uses a 5 point Likert scale for 100 items with five items representing each of the 20 satisfaction factors. For this study, only the total general satisfaction score which uses one item for each of the 20 factors and can range from 20 to 100 was used. The long form of the MSQ has reliability coefficients ranging from .59 to .97. However, reliability varies across groups, and it is suggested that internal consistency reliability coefficients be computed for a sample representing the group on which the MSQ is used. The MSQ has been validated by numerous research studies.

Research Design and Procedure

The instruments were administered to the 37 selected participants during the July 1989 Summer Institute of the Texas A&M MLDP. Of the 37 selected participants, 36 chose to participate in the study. The 36 non-selected individuals were contacted by telephone, informed of the purpose of the study, and asked to respond to the instruments by the mail. The instruments were mailed to the non-selected group with a cover letter explaining the procedures. A postage-paid return envelope was included to encourage the participation of the non-selected group. The instruments were mailed four weeks after the selected group data was collected. Telephone follow-up was used to ensure participation in the study. The response rate achieved was 100%.

To answer question 1, descriptive statistics were used to create a profile of the work values and the current level of job satisfaction. Means and standard deviations for all variables are provided.

To answer question 2, all work values and the job satisfaction measure were related to the moderator variables of participation in the leadership project, ethniticy, gender, professional experience, and level of education using t tests or correlations.

Results

Question 1 concerns the work values and job satisfaction for the minority sample under study. The data necessary to answer this question is provided in the first column of Tables 1 and 2. From Table 1, which reports the results for the Values

---

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Scale (VS), it can be seen that all of the values were responded to as of above average importance since all scores are above the mean T score of 50. Those values which are equal to or greater than a .5 standard deviation over the mean (T = 55) are marked in the table with a + sign. Using this criteria, 12 of the 21 values could be considered high. The six highest held values in descending order are: Cultural Identity, Advancement, Creativity, Aesthetics, Authority, and Economic Security.

The results of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) analyses are reported in Table 2. From the table it can be seen that the range in values is much greater than was observed for the VS. This occurred largely because the MIQ is an ipsative instrument which forces some scores down in order for other scores to be high. Using a score of 30 or greater to denote importance, 11 important values can be observed. Using the criteria of a .5 standard deviation over the male norms for ages 26 to 45 from the test manual, the following five values appear to be most important: Compensation, Authority, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, and Supervision-Technical.

The total scores for the MSQ appears at the bottom of Table 2. The score reported (77.7) is approximately equal to the average for employed non-disabled adults ($\bar{X}$ = 77.86).

Question 2 has five parts, the first of which deals with the difference between those who were selected to participate in the MLDP and those who were not. The data for this question is also presented in tables 1 and 2 in the right hand column. The VS data presented in Table 1 reveals that the two groups differed on only seven of the 21 values and in all cases the selected group had lower values for: Physical Activity, Social Interaction, Social Relations, Variety, Working Conditions, Cultural Identity, and Physical Prowess.

The MIQ data is presented in table 2 and indicates that the selected group differed from the non-selected group on 8 of the

21 values. Of these, the selected group held higher values for Ability Utilization, Advancement, Responsibility, and Autonomy, while the non-selected group valued Activity, Independence, Working Conditions, and Co-Workers more highly.

The MSQ difference between selected and non-selected is also presented at the bottom of Table 2. From the table it can be seen that the selected group had significantly lower current job satisfaction.

The second and third parts of question 2 concerns ethnic and gender differences on the two values instruments and on job satisfaction. The left hand side of Tables 3 and 4 contains the data necessary to answer these parts of the questions. From

---

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

---

an examination of both sets of data in each table it can be seen that only two of 42 differences exist for the ethnic comparison while there are four of 42 gender comparison differences. Given the few differences found in the large number of comparisons, it may be appropriate to conclude that only the two gender differences that exceeded the .01 level should be interpreted as real differences. In these two cases, females valued Ability Utilization and Creativity more than did males. The MSQ comparisons also yielded no ethnic or gender differences.

The last two parts of question 2 concerned the relationship between the professional experience and level of education of the

sample and scores on the two values instruments and the job satisfaction measure. The data for this analysis is presented as Pearson product-moment correlations on the right hand side of Tables 3 and 4. From the tables, it can be seen that for professional experience only seven of 42 comparisons yielded relationships that exceed the probability of a .05 chance occurance, and only one (Social Service) has a relationship that is significant at the .01 level. If one choses to interpret these relationships as real, it could be concluded that for this sample (and the population which they represent) there is a tendency for those with greater professional experience to value Advancement, Aesthetics, Altruism, Economic Rewards, Security, Working Conditions, and Social Service more highly.

For the relationship between level of education and values, only three exceeded a .05 chance occurance. Only Achievement, which exceeded chance at the .01 level, is likely to represent a real relationship. That is, those who had more education tended to value achievement more.

The analysis of job satisfaction and its relationship to professional experience and level of education failed to yield statistically significant results.

Discussion and Conclusions

A problem encountered by community colleges is the lack of minority administrators, specifically Black and Hispanic administrators, to reflect the large percentages of minority students enrolled in community colleges. This study focused

on potential minority administrators in community colleges in Texas. A fall 1988 faculty headcount revealed that Blacks accounted for 5% and Hispanics 8% of total faculty employed in Texas public junior colleges while 10% of Black and 19% of Hispanic students were enrolled during the same semester.

Word (1989) reported that in 1985 the Hispanic population in Texas accounted for 21% of all the Hispanics living in the United States. Texas, with 3.7 million Hispanics in 1985, ranked second among states in Hispanic population. The Black population in Texas in 1985 accounted for 7% of all the Blacks living in the United States. In 1985, Texas ranked third among states in Black population with 1.9 million Blacks.

Minority leadership development programs have made it possible for minorities to enter or advance in administrative positions. While these programs have selected potential minority administrators with respect to administrative ability, they have not identified relevant affective qualities such as work values and job satisfaction. This information can be appropriately used to increase the body of knowledge on minority leadership.

The development of norms for Black and Hispanic administrators on work values and job satisfaction has practical importance as it addresses one aspect of minority leadership. While there has been much written on work values and job satisfaction, there has been little written on the work values and job satisfaction of minorities in professional occupations.

From the results reported, it appears that the following

conclusions are warranted:

1. The minorities who were included in this study differed from non-minority norm groups on selected work values. They appear to value Ability Utilization, Advancement, Aesthetics, Altruism, Authority, Creativity, Personal Development, Social Interaction, Variety, Working Conditions, Cultural Identity, Economic Security, Compensation, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, and Supervision-Technical more highly.
2. Those minorities who were selected to participate in the MLDP differed somewhat on work values from those who applied, but were not selected. Although there was no systematic effort to select participants based on values the evidence suggests that those selected valued Physical Activity, Social Interaction, Social Relations, Variety, Working Conditions, Cultural Identity, Physical Prowess, Activity, Independence, and Co-Workers less and Advancement, Responsibility, and Autonomy more than those not selected.
3. Minorities selected for the MLDP differed from those not selected on current job satisfaction. The data suggests that those selected were less satisfied with their current jobs.
4. When Black and Hispanic minority candidates for the MLDP were compared on work values they did not appear to differ.
5. When male and female minority candidates for the MLDP were compared on work values they appeared to differ very little. If there were a difference, it could be said that female

minority candidates valued Ability Utilization and Creativity more.

6. Years of professional experience do not appear to bear any relationship to work values for the minority leadership candidates studied. If there were a relationship, it may be that those with more experience valued Social Service more.
7. Level of education did not appear to be related to the work values held by the minority leadership candidates studied. If any relationship does exist, it may be that those with more education valued Achievement more.

References

Barrera, M. (1984, May). Hispanics and community colleges. Paper presented at the meeting of the Hispanic Roundtable Meeting, Phoenix, AZ.

Bernstein, A.R. (1984). Foundation support for administrative advancement: a mixed record. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, and S. Kaplan (Ed's.) Women in Higher Administration. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Garza, M.J. (1984, May). Current staffing patterns. Paper presented at the meeting of the Hispanic Roundtable Meeting, Phoenix, AZ.

Harvard, P.A. (1986, April). Successful behaviors of Black women administrators in higher education: implications for leadership. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Kimmons, K.M. (1977). Black administrators in public community colleges. New York, NY: Carlton Press.

Moore, K.M. et al. (1985). Today's academic leaders: a national study of administrator's in community and junior colleges. Pennyslvania State University, University Park, Center for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 927)

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leader's for America's Schools. University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 265)

Rivera, M. (1983, November). Hispanic participation in the administration of the California community colleges: 1981-82. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Mexican-American Educators, Fresno, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238-622)

Rounds, J.B. & Dawis, R.V. (1975). A comparison of multiple rank order and paired comparison forms of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (Research Report No. 49). Minneapolis, Minnesota: Work Adjustment Project.

Super, D. (1970). Manual: Work Values inventory. Boston: MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Tinsley, A. (1986). Upward mobility for women administrators. Journal of National Association of Women, Deans, and Counselors. 3(Fall), pp. 3 - 11.

Upgrading Minorities: Patterns and Trends, 1970-1978. North Carolina State Department of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174 - 271)

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., Lofquist, L.H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation (Whole No. XX11).

Willie, C.V. (1984). Leadership development programs for minorities: an evaluation. Urban Review, 16(4), pp. 209 - 217.

Word, D.L. (1989). Population estimates by race and Hispanic origin for states, metropolitan areas, and selected counties: 1980 - 1985. Current Population Reports, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P - 25, No. 1040 - RD - 1.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Total Sample and Participation on the Values Scale

Variable	Total		Participation[a]			
			S		NS	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Ability Utilization	55.2+	8.2	53.4	9.2	57.1	6.6
Achievement	54.9	8.4	53.2	9.8	56.5	6.6
Advancement	56.8+	8.7	55.5	8.4	58.2	8.9
Aesthetics	56.2+	9.1	55.1	8.7	57.3	9.4
Altruism	55.4+	7.0	54.7	7.3	56.1	6.6
Authority	56.2+	8.6	56.0	8.3	56.4	9.0
Autonomy	52.7	7.8	51.1	8.1	54.4	7.3
Creativity	56.5+	8.1	55.4	8.7	57.5	7.5
Economic Rewards	54.4	9.5	52.5	9.3	56.2	9.4
Life Style	52.1	8.6	50.6	8.2	53.6	8.8
Personal Development	55.7+	8.4	56.0	9.6	55.5	7.2
Physical Activity	54.3	9.3	50.5	8.2	58.2**	8.9
Prestige	53.5	9.5	52.9	10.3	54.1	8.6
Risk	54.1	9.1	52.1	8.2	56.1	9.6
Social Interaction	55.0+	8.7	52.9	7.8	57.1*	9.2
Social Relations	53.1	11.3	46.6	9.3	59.6**	9.4
Variety	55.5+	9.3	51.5	8.1	59.6**	10.0
Working Conditions	55.9+	7.7	53.6	8.7	58.2**	5.5
Cultural Identity	58.3+	8.8	54.1	8.2	62.5**	7.3
Physical Prowess	54.7	12.3	49.0	7.1	60.4**	13.8
Economic Security	56.2+	6.9	54.8	7.4	57.6	6.1

a S=Selected, NS=Non-Selected

\+ = Differences from adult means greater than .5 standard deviation ($T \geq 55$).

* $p<.05$, two tailed. ** $p<.01$, two tailed for differences between Selected and Non-Selected.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Total Sample and Participation on the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Variable	Total		Participation[a]			
			S		NS	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Ability Utilization	35.7	6.7	37.3*	6.5	34.0	6.5
Achievement	37.7	6.7	38.6	6.7	36.7	6.8
Activity	23.7	8.1	20.7	7.1	26.6**	8.0
Independence	20.8	8.7	18.0	7.1	23.6**	8.5
Variety	25.4	5.9	24.7	5.8	25.2	5.9
Compensation	31.8+	7.5	30.9	7.4	32.7	7.7
Security	31.9	8.5	30.1	7.8	33.6	8.7
Working Conditions	29.4	6.4	27.5	6.4	31.3*	5.9
Advancement	34.2	7.2	36.4**	8.2	32.0	5.4
Recognition	31.6	6.6	32.0	6.9	31.3	6.3
Authority	22.4+	8.5	21.2	8.5	23.8	8.4
Social Status	24.1+	9.0	22.3	8.1	25.9	9.6
Co-Workers	25.6	7.1	23.3	7.0	28.0**	6.4
Social Service	31.1	7.0	30.0	6.5	31.2	7.6
Moral Values	31.5	9.4	32.7	11.0	30.2	7.5
Company Policies	30.1	6.6	30.5	7.6	29.7	5.6
Sup--Human Relations	28.6+	5.8	27.9	6.2	29.4	5.3
Sup--Technical	26.3+	5.8	25.5	6.6	27.1	4.9
Creativity	32.3	5.2	32.9	5.3	31.6	5.2
Responsibility	33.1	5.6	34.7*	5.7	31.5	5.2
Autonomy	31.6	7.5	33.8*	6.6	29.5	7.7
MSQ[b]	77.7	8.9	74.9	9.5	80.5**	7.2

a S=Selected, NS=Non-Selected

b Mean for MSQ for employed non-disabled is 77.86.

+ = Differences between mean for total group and 50%ile for male norms for ages 26 to 45 exceed .5 standard deviation for MIQ.

* $p<.05$, two-tailed. ** $p<.01$, two-tailed for differences between Selected and Non-selected.

TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Ethnicity, Gender, Professional Experience, and Level of Education on the Values Scale

Variable	Ethnicity[a]		Gender[a]		Professional Experience	Level of Education
	H	B	F	M	r	r
Aut	56.9	53.7	55.1	55.4	.12	-.11
	(5.7)	(5.7)	(8.2)	(8.2)		
Ach.	56.0	53.7	54.0	55.7	-.05	-.10
	(6.5)	(9.9)	(8.3)	(8.6)		
Adv.	57.0	56.2	56.6	57.1	.28*	-.03
	(9.4)	(8.2)	(6.9)	(10.3)		
Aes.	56.0	56.4	53.8	58.6*	.28*	-.03
	(8.6)	(9.6)	(8.4)	(9.2)		
Alt.	56.0	54.8	55.3	55.5	.25*	.06
	(6.6)	(7.4)	(6.7)	(7.3)		
Ath.	58.3*	52.3	57.1	55.3	.03	.07
	(6.4)	(9.9)	(9.2)	(7.9)		
Aut.	53.2	52.3	53.7	51.8	-.01	.22*
	(7.4)	(8.3)	(7.5)	(8.2)		
Cre.	56.7	56.2	57.8	55.1	.03	-.02
	(6.9)	(9.2)	(7.5)	(8.6)		
Eco.	54.7	54.1	55.6	53.1	.23*	.21
	(9.2)	(9.8)	(7.5)	(11.0)		
Lif.	53.9	50.4	53.1	51.1	-.08	.15
	(8.1)	(8.9)	(7.8)	(9.4)		
Per.	56.5	54.9	56.8	54.6	-.01	.10
	(7.6)	(9.2)	(8.5)	(8.4)		
Phy.	55.4	53.2	52.7	56.0	.10	.19
	(9.2)	(9.5)	(10.4)	(8.4)		
Pre.	53.9	53.1	53.5	53.6	-.09	.16
	(8.9)	(10.1)	(9.3)	(9.8)		
Ris.	54.8	53.5	54.4	53.9	.03	-.02
	(8.9)	(9.3)	(10.0)	(8.1)		
SoI.	55.2	54.8	54.3	55.7	.01	-.08
	(8.3)	(9.2)	(8.2)	(9.3)		
SoR.	53.5	52.8	50.6	55.6	.09	.03
	(11.3)	(11.5)	(11.4)	(10.8)		
Var.	57.2	53.9	53.9	57.2	.05	-.03
	(9.5)	(10.2)	(8.5)	(11.1)		
WoC.	55.8	53.9	55.6	56.2	.11	.05
	(7.8)	(7.7)	(8.1)	(7.5)		
Cul.	57.5	59.0	56.8	59.7	.14	.10
	(9.4)	(8.2)	(7.8)	(9.6)		
Phy.	53.3	12.8	54.8	54.6	.02	.06
	(12.8)	(11.8)	(13.4)	(11.3)		
Eco.	56.7	55.6	55.2	57.1	.17	-.01
	(5.8)	(7.8)	(6.1)	(7.5)		

a Means are top numbers, standard deviations are in parenthesis.
* $p<.05$, two-tailed. ** $p<.01$, two-tailed.

TABLE 4
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Ethnicity, Gender, Professional Experience, and Level of Education on the Minnesota Importance Questionaire and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Variable	Ethnicity[a]		Gender[a]		Professional Experience	Level of Education
	H	B	F	M	r	r
Abi.	36.7	34.7	37.8**	33.5	-.06	.06
	(6.9)	(6.4)	(6.9)	(5.8)		
Ach.	38.4	36.9	39.4*	36.0	-.02	.29**
	(7.4)	(6.1)	(5.8)	(7.3)		
Act.	24.2	23.2	22.3	25.1	-.01	-.06
	(7.5)	(8.6)	(7.3)	(8.6)		
Ind.	21.7	19.9	19.2	22.4	-.03	-.09
	(7.8)	(9.6)	(7.9)	(9.4)		
Var.	26.2	24.7	24.5	26.4	-.01	-.11
	(5.5)	(6.2)	(6.2)	(5.5)		
Com.	31.8	32.0	31.1	32.6	.01	.02
	(8.1)	(7.0)	(6.8)	(8.2)		
Sec.	31.8	32.0	31.1	32.6	.25*	-.08
	(8.1)	(9.0)	(8.9)	(8.1)		
WoC.	28.0	30.8	29.0	29.8	.23*	.05
	(7.4)	(5.0)	(6.9)	(5.9)		
Adv.	34.2	34.2	35.4	33.0	-.03	.05
	(7.5)	(7.1)	(6.3)	(8.0)		
Rec.	32.0	31.3	30.6	32.6	-.11	.16
	(6.3)	(6.9)	(7.2)	(5.8)		
Ath.	23.4	21.5	20.7	24.2	.01	-.04
	(7.6)	(9.3)	(8.9)	(7.8)		
SoS.	21.8	26.3*	23.5	24.7	.02	.09
	(9.6)	(7.8)	(7.9)	(10.1)		
CoW.	25.6	25.7	25.0	26.3	.07	.05
	(6.5)	(7.7)	(8.3)	(5.6)		
SoS.	30.7	31.4	30.7	31.5	.30**	.22*
	(7.3)	(6.9)	(7.3)	(6.7)		
Mor.	31.9	31.0	31.4	31.5	.10	-.10
	(11.5)	(6.9)	(10.3)	(8.5)		
CoP.	30.3	30.1	31.0	29.2	.16	-.15
	(7.3)	(6.1)	(5.4)	(7.7)		
SHR.	29.6	27.7	28.8	28.5	.08	-.07
	(6.5)	(5.0)	(4.7)	(6.8)		
SuT.	25.5	27.0	26.8	26.0	-.01	-.10
	(6.5)	(5.1)	(5.4)	(6.3)		
Cre.	33.2	31.4	34.1**	30.4	.01	.21
	(6.4)	(3.6)	(5.5)	(4.2)		
Res.	34.8	31.4	33.8	32.4	-.13	.12
	(5.5)	(5.4)	(6.2)	(5.0)		
Aut.	33.1	30.2	33.1	30.2	-.14	.05
	(8.0)	(6.7)	(6.8)	(7.9)		
MSQ	77.8	77.7	79.5	76.0	-.08	-.06
	(9.3)	(8.5)	(8.5)	(9.0)		

a Means are top numbers, standard deviations are in parenthesis.
* $p<.05$, two-tailed. ** $p<.01$, two-tailed.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 19 1990